

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,897	05/20/1999	ANAND RAMAKRISHNA	1890	8450

7590 08/12/2004

THE LAW OFFICES OF
AKBERT S MICHALIK
704 228TH AVENUE NE
SUITE 193
REDMOND, WA 98053

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/316,897	Applicant(s) RAMAKRISHNA, ANAND	
	Examiner Maikhanh Nguyen	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 04/22/2004 to the original application filed 06/22/1999.
2. Claims 1-47 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 30 are independent claims.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the limit of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following phrases lack antecedent basis:

- "the behavior" (claim 17, line 3; claim 30, line 3)
- "the external component" (claim 30, line 7)

Dependent claims 18-29 and 31-47 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27-39, and 43-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gudmundson et al.** (U.S. 5,907,704 – filed 10/1996).

As to independent claim 17, Gudmundson teaches a method of providing dynamic effects to an HTML document (*e.g., any element can link dynamically ... on the World Wide Web; col.11, lines 8-15*), comprising the steps of:

- encapsulating code in an external component for affecting the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents (*e.g., the system automatically 'encapsulated' ... once encapsulated, they can be used in other 'environments' ... their elements and behaviors are thus selectively reusable; col.9, lines 1-39*);

- inserting an element into a document (*e.g., embed a title within a Word Wide Web page; col. 11, lines 8-16 / the first Element ... to be embedded in a first Web page; col.88, lines 21-22*);

and

- providing the document to a render (*col.11, lines 16-21*).

While Gudmundson teaches the association of the element and the external component (*Elements generally can be linked to the external media 'such as text, sounds, pictures, animations and movies; col.8, lines 39-45*), Gudmundson does not explicitly teach “attaching a reference in the document.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Gudmundson's teaching to include "*attaching a reference in the document*" because it would have allowed the element in the document to possess certain inherent characteristics relating to that external component.

The fact that Gudmundson's teaching "create reusable 'object container' merely by defining links among instantiated object" (col.7, line 64-col.8, line 6) and purpose of using the attaching a reference in Gudmundson suggests that defined links in the document to associate the element with the external component.

As to dependent claim 18, Gudmundson teaches providing the external component to the renderer (*col.11, lines 16-21*).

As to dependent claim 19, Gudmundson teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and modifying a representation of the element based on the code in the external component (*col.22, lines 21-30 /col.39, lines 12-23*).

As to dependent claim 21, Gudmundson teaches modifying a presentation of the element includes the changing the appearance thereof (*col.21, lines 21-30/ col.24, lines 56-63/col.45, lines 65-67/col.39, lines 12-23*).

As to dependent claim 22, Gudmundson teaches modifying a presentation of the element includes the changing the location thereof (*col.21, lines 21-30/ col.24, lines 56-63/col.45, lines 65-67/col.39, lines 12-23*).

As to dependent claim 23, Gudmundson teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and drawing information in the image based on the code in the external component (*col.23, lines 66-col.24, line 21*).

As to dependent claim 24, Gudmundson teaches rendering a page image from the document is interleaved with drawing information in the image (*col.24, lines 1-21*).

As to dependent claim 25, Gudmundson teaches receiving an event indicative of user interaction with the image (*col.43, lines 40-51*).

As to dependent claim 27, Gudmundson teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a custom tag (*col.15, lines 44-65*).

As to dependent claim 28, Gudmundson teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a class identifier (*col.14, lines 38-61*).

As to dependent claim 29, Gudmundson teaches the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained inline with the element in the document (*col.15, lines 44-65*).

As to independent claim 1, it is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, claim 17 further recites:

- rendering a page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the page image including a representation of the element (*e.g., create various types of Elements and to assign particular characteristic to each Element; col.13, lines 24-59*); and

- accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element rendered on the page image (*elements generally can be linked to the external media ... possess certain inherent characteristics relating to that media; col.8, lines 39-45/col.13, line 60-col.14, line 7*).

As to dependent claim 2, Gudmundson teaches receiving an event, and wherein accessing the external component is performed in response to the event (*col.17, lines 51-60*).

As to dependent claims 3-5, they include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 6, Gudmundson teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein accessing the external component includes instantiating an instance of the object (*col.7, line 65- col.8, lines 6*).

As to dependent claim 7, Gudmundson teaches receiving a new document having another element thereon, the new document including information associating the other element with the external component, rendering a new page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the new page image including a representation of the other element, and accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element rendered on the page image (*Fig.1 and associated text*).

As to dependent claims 9-12, they include the same limitations as in claims 26-29, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 13, Gudmundson teaches the document includes another element having a representation thereof rendered in the page image, the document includes other information associating the other element with the external component, and further comprising, accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element (*col.13, lines 24-37*).

As to dependent claim 14, Gudmundson teaches the document includes information associating the element with a second external component, and further comprising, accessing the

second external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element
(*col.13, lines 24-37*).

As to dependent claim 15, Gudmundson teaches resolving a conflict between the behavior determined by the external component and the behavior determined by the second external component (*col.18, lines 3-26*).

As to dependent claim 16, Gudmundson teaches downloading the external component
(*col.1, lines 8-15*).

As to independent claim 30, it is directed to a computer system for performing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, claim 30 further recites “modifying the behavior of elements.”

Gudmundson teaches modifying the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents (*modify an object's characteristics and reuse it in other environments; col.8, lines 20-54 / modify their elements so as to 'inherit' and 'disinherit' characteristics; col.9, lines 18-29*).

As to dependent claim 31, it includes the same limitations as in claim 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 32, Gudmundson teaches the renderer displays a representation of the element and modifies a behavior of the element by accessing the external component
(*col.9, lines 18-28*).

As to dependent claims 33-35, they include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 36, Gudmundson teaches the renderer calls the external component a plurality of times to draw information on the page image, and the renderer draws information on the page image between at least some of calls to the external component (*col.16, lines 57-67*).

As to dependent claim 37, Gudmundson teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein the rendered instantiates an instance of the object (*col.18, lines 3-26*).

As to dependent claim 38, Gudmundson teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein the rendered communicates with the object (*col.18, lines 3-13*).

As to dependent claim 39, Gudmundson teaches the render receives a new document having another element thereon that references the external component (*col.22, lines 21-30*).

As to dependent claim 40, it includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 43, it includes the same limitations as in claim 27, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 44-46, they include the same limitations as in claims 12-14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 47, Gudmundson teaches the renderer accesses the external component to control the format of data input by a user (*col.14, lines 30-61*).

6. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gudmundson et al.** in view of **Courts et al.** (U.S. 6,085,220 – filed 09/1998).

As to dependent claim 20, Gudmundson does not explicitly teach “a COM object.”

Courts teaches a COM object (*COM objects; fig. 1*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Courts in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the enhanced capability for customizing dynamic content in the generated HTML documents.

As to dependent claim 8, it includes the same limitations as in claim 20, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 9, 26 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gudmundson et al.** in view of **Pacifici et al.** (U.S. 6,230,171 – filed 08/1998).

As to dependent claim 9, Gudmundson teaches associating the element with the external component (*col.8, lines 40-45/ col.14, lines 4-7*), but does not explicitly teach “the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet.”

Pacifici teaches the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet (*col.9, line 55-col.19, line 7*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to dependent claim 26, note the discussion of claim 9 above for the rejection of “the external component is maintained in a cascading stylesheet.”

As to dependent claim 40, it includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 41, Gudmundson does not explicitly teach “the cascading style sheet is embedded in the document.”

Pacifici teaches the cascading style sheet is embedded in the document (*dynamic HTML ... using a Cascading Style Sheet; col.9, line 47-col.10, line 7*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to dependent claim 42, Gudmundson does not explicitly teach “the cascading style sheet is linked to the document.”

Pacifici teaches the cascading style sheet is linked to the document (*col.6, lines 1-29*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Gudmundson because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gudmundson et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,680,619	issued: Oct. 21, 1997
Cook et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,178,432	issued: Jan. 23, 2001
Cuome et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,286,043	issued: Sep. 4, 2001
Godden et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,401,077	issued: Jun.4, 2002

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
August 6, 2004


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER